NOTE:

MISHI'S KONDON

pages and should be substituted for the 21719 corresponding pages in the record.

(cont'd)

No.	Tef. No.	Pros.	Description For Ident.	In Evidence
999	2569		Map showing the various Sectors or Divisions of Hankow, showing various Routes of Entry of the various Units and their disposition	21783
1001	2570		Description of Inscriptions on the Map, "a, b, c" etc.	21784
1342	2571		Affidavit of SAKURAI, Tokutaro	21792
875	2572		Affidavit of YOKCYAMA, Isamu	21795
1012	2573		Affidavit of ARUGA, Kazunaga	21807

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

No.	No.	Pros.	Description For Ident	. Evidence
999	2569		Map showing the various Sectors or Divisions of Hankow, showing various Routes of Entry of the various Units and their disposition	21783
1001	2570		Description of Inscriptions on the Map, "a, b, c" etc.	21784
1342	2571		Affidavit of SAKURAI, Tokutaro	21792
875	2572		Affidavit of YOKCYAMA, Isamu	21795
1012	2573		Affidavit of ARUGA, Kazunaga	21807

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

No.	Def. No.	Pros. No.	Description	For In Ident.Evidence
1295	2561		Chief of Staff-Very S Central Chies Oper Order No. 125 - Or the Expeditionary Central Chins, dat October, Commanding quarters Kiuking	ational der to Army in ed 24
1274	2562	E	the China Expedition Forces during the I War"	onery
1370	2563	Λ	ffidavit of HASEGAWA . Kiyoshi	21741
1353	2564	A	ffidavit of AMANO, Sh	noichi 21748
923	2565	A	rticle appearing on 6 1944 in The ASAHI S (published with the "Embrace the People Great Love") dispat the 5th from a Hemb the Information Cor the Front Lines of Province to Officer Men	Shimbun title with sched on per of ps from HUNAN
1089	2566	A	ffidavit of USHIJIMA, (with the exception paragraph 3 thereof	Sadao of
1002	2567	A:	ffidavit of SANO, Tor	
1000	2568		notograph showing the quarters Unit of th Regiment Marching i Japanese Concession	Head- e SANO n the of
			Hankow	21782

TANAKA

witness doesn't answer my questions. I asked him to tell what crosses -- the witness was asked what crosses put on the map mean in Japanese military language and the witness remembers that according to his contention the fighting took place at this place.

THE PRESIDENT: No, that is not what he said. I do not think you heard him right, General. He said, in effect, those crosses are used by the Japanese military people to indicate where clashes occurred. He did not say that the clashes occurred there.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Then I apologize.

Probably I don't understand him correctly. I have another question.

Q Can you tell, Mr. Witness, what regulations say that crosses indicate -- by crosses the places where the clashes occur are indicated?

A This is army practice; practice of the Japanese Army.

Q What are those regulations of the Japanese Army? Can you name them so we can check them?

THE PRESIDENT: There are so many that we could not ask him that.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If there was such a

IR. FURNESS: My objection, if your Honor please, was to the fact that it calls for the conclusion of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: The bare facts would not enable us to decide when it is a question of military strategy or military tactics. But, he is an expert. I think the question can be properly put to a man who is an expert.

The objection is overruled.

will you answer please?

A Of course, it must be admitted that Vladivostok can be seen from Changkufeng, but I do not
believe that Changkufeng had any strategic value
from a military point of view, because there were no
railroads or roads in the rear and was not an appropriate base of operation for attack on Vladivostok.

It was valueless as a base of operation for attack
against Vladivostok.

is seen from the top of this hill, it could be fired at also from the top of this hill.

1 2

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

IR. FURNESS: I object to these questions, if your Honor please. The affidavit is on record and speaks for itself.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he can't be asked whether he hid anything from you unless he admits there is something which leads to that.

MR. FURNESS: It is like asking him "Why didn't you answer a question which you weren't asked."

to the questions of the cross-examination the witness admits that the documents in question -- admitted the possibility that the documents in question were among the documents and maybe are among them now which were evacuated from Tokyo.

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: The documents which are mentioned in your affidavit.

COLONEL IVANOV: (Continuing) If he came to know about this, it is natural to ask why didn't the vitness, who was at the head of the Archives Section of the Foreign Office, didn't clarify this question an his affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: As far as I can judge he has study to his story as given in the examination in chief. He hasn't said anything inconsistent with that I

recovering them? Did your predecessor remain responsible or did the responsibility fall on you?

THE WITNESS: The question of bringing back these documents to the Foreign Office -- the responsibility rested with my predecessor. I believe that is so.

- Q What was his name?
- A I believe it was Section Chief ISONO.

 THE PRESIDENT: How did the responsibility come to be divided in that way?

A Puring the time that I held the office there were no documents brought back to the Foreign Office -- as a Section Chief. I understand that the documents were brought back from the place where they had been removed to during the time Mr. ISONO was Chief of the Section.

Q Now, you referred to a record showing the documents or describing the documents that had been destroyed by fire. Was there also a record showing the documents which had been concealed in air raid shelters and warehouses over Japan?

A From what I recall here, only the -- the records only mention the fact of those documents which were destroyed by fire.

Q How was it possible, then, to determine

25

24

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

would not have to depend on his recollection over nine years, if we have that.

MR. FURNESS: I will be glad to have the witness asked the question about it. We have introduced evidence in the past few days with regard to telegrams and messages in the Foreign Office.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, get him to clear that up.

The telegram which you say was your report is not that referred to in paragraph 4, is it?

GENERAL VASILIEV: I think the defense conducting the examination should have asked this question first of all, and not about how he passed his time, what time he got up and what time he went to bed.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I am asking the question, General, you can not object to that.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I didn't want to object to your question, your Honor. If you understood it in such way, I beg your pardon, sir.

THE WITNESS: Mr. President, you referred to a report or telegram in paragraph 4, but I cannot locate that word in the Japanese text. That is the word "report."

THE PRESIDENT: In paragraph 4, you said you

6

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

MIURA

drafted a telegram in the name of the Vice-Consul at Hunchun to the Foreign Minister in Tokyo. In paragraph 8 you refer to your report which you say now was a telegram. The telegram in paragraph 4 was not your report. It was something you wrote for the Vice Consul. Can you clear that up?

THE WITNESS: Inasmuch as I was on a temporary trip, I had no authority to send telegrams in my name from a place where there was a Consulate or Consular General.

THE PRESIDENT: But you filed your report to Tokyo from where? From Hunchun?

THE WITNESS: Yes, from Hunchun.

THE PRESIDENT: And that report is identical with the telegram you sent in the name of the Vice-Consul, is that so?

THE WITNESS: Yes, whenever any telegrams were filed from Hunchun it was filed in the name of the Vice Consul there -- the head of the Consulate there.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you prepared to admit -- are you prepared not to object to that telegram, General?

GENERAL VASILIEV: If that copy will have certificate, due certificate, I will not object to it,

MR. TAVENNER: It is "auxiliary material" instead of "auxiliary matter."

3.

MR. FURNESS: In my copy it is "matter."

THE PRESIDENT: Ordinarily you wouldn't refer to oral testimony as material.

I'R. TAVENNER: It is "material" everywhere I read it.

THE PRESIDENT: And an affidavit would be a document.

a document from the Foreign Office, Official Business Report for 1938, compiled by the First Section of the Euro-Asiatic Bureau, Foreign Office, Tokyo, 1938.

It is defense document 1511. It is being tendered merely for identification at this point. I will make my tender of the excerpt later.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1511
will receive exhibit No. 2647 for identification only.
(Whereupon, the document above

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2647 for identification.)

IIR. FURNESS: This document has been on file for the required time under the rules of the Court.

I offer in evidence an excerpt from defense document No. 1511, secret Foreign Office official

the defense and the Tribunal with the map which was attached to the original of Exhibit 766. I still have a few witnesses which have not yet been available and I am not certain when they will be available, but I will try to produce them as soon as possible.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the reason for their non-production now, Major Furness?

MR. FURNESS: Some are ill but we expect they will get well, others we have not been able to premare the affidavits yet. There may be other matters revealed in the record, but I think I have covered them all. With that in mind, Mr. Blakeney will now carry on the next phases of the defense on the Russian phase.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, the next point to be made the object of evidence is the Nomonhan, or Khalkin-Gol incident. I shall first offer in evidence, as proof that the territory in which the soi-disant Mongolian People's Republic was established not only was indisputably Chinese, but had been expressly recognized to be such by the U.S.S.R., DD1576, being excerpts from the convention signed in Peking in 1924 between the U.S.S.R. and the Republic of China.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: May I ask a question to find out for what purpose is this document presented, and what is the purpose of this document?

THE PRESIDENT: I am afraid you will have to leave that to the Bench, if they are in doubt, General. You can raise any objection you like.

Major Blakeney gave his reason. Are you going to object to it?

GENERAL VASILIEV: I don't see that this document has any relevancy to the issues of the case.

THE PRESIDENT: You object to it on the ground of irrelevancy. Major Blakeney, what do you-GENERAL VASILIEV: Yes, your Honor, that is quite correct, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney, we will hear you.

MR. BLAKENEY: I think the document is clearly relevant for at least four reasons which I shall state seriatim.

Firstly, Minister Golunsky, in his opening of the Russian phase for the prosecution, stated on page 7254 of the record that Japan - "knew well of the existing treaty of mutual assistance between the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic.

20'

They knew beforehand that an attack on the territory of this Republic would inevitably lead to a clash of arms with the Soviet Union and consciously were ready to do it." That is the end of the quotation. The Nomonhan incident is thus charged as aggression against the U.S.S.R but if the territory involved was Chinese, the Tribunal may well wonder a little how the case is made out. Japan knowing well that the U.S.S.R's solemn recognition by treaty of the China Sovereignty over outer Mongolia, could in no way have supposed that frontier troubles of cuter Mongolia would in any way involve a foreign power.

Secondly, I shall presently, on the question of the Manchurian Mongolian frontier or boundary, offer some evidence from Chinese sources. Clearly, the weight to be attached to this evidence may depend to some extent upon the question of sovereignty over the territory involved. That is, the Chinese can speak of the boundaries of their own country with more authority than those of a foreign country.

Thirdly, the evidence has shown, and will show that much of the national and especially military policy of Japan was conditioned by what was considered to be the Soviet menace of which Japan was never unconscious. Japan may well indeed have been moved

to take military measures of self-defense by the discovery that the U.S.S.R. was even extending it's military threat by establishing and entering into a military alliance with puppet states on the periphery of Manchuria.

And, fourthly, the Soviet encroachment in outer Mongolia has a bearing on the question whether the Nine Power Treaty, Prosecution's Exhibit 28, had become a dead letter, for while the U.S.S.R. was not a signatory of that treaty, nevertheless, it's action in violation thereof could but effect alteration of the fundamental conditions in which, and the hypothesis upon which that treaty which the defendants are charged with violating was grounded. That is my submission, your Honors.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Might I be allowed to say a few words?

THE PRESIDENT: Well there is no objection, go ahead. We have prevented Mr. Keenan from replying where he opened the debate. If the defense have no objection we will hear you. If they have, we must not allow you.

MR. BLAKENEY: No objection whatever.